DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 953 IR 001 132

AUTHOR Rugg, John Daily
TITLE The Public Library's Publicity Program: How Do Those Involved View It?
PUB DATE Dec 73
NOTE 67p.; Master's thesis, Brigham Young University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Communications; Information Dissemination; Library Research; Library Surveys; News Media; Program Evaluation; *Publicize; *Public Libraries; Public Relations
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

In order to find out what librarians and newsmen think about the basic content and usual quality of the library publicity program, and how there views differ, the author surveyed a group of public libraries, newspapers, and radio and television stations in Ohio, soliciting opinions on what Ohio public libraries are doing, and how well, in the realm of publicity. Results indicated that librarians and newsmen agree that public libraries in Ohio are doing less well with publicity than they should. Generally, public library publicity tends to print oriented, proviing somewhat more effective with newspapers than with the electronic media. Library publicity services most commonly provided to Ohio news media were written news releases, continuing library-media contact, and provision of news tips and background information. Additional effort to focus public library messages through radio and television could improve communication with the public. Sample questionnaires, selected comments from some survey responders, and a bibliography are appended. (Author/LS)

ED 096953

T R

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY'S PUBLICITY PROGRAM: HOW DO THOSE INVOLVED VIEW IT?

A Research Project

Submitted to the

Graduate Department of Library and Information Sciences

of the

Brigham Young University

Provo, Utah

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Library Science

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

John Daily Rugg, M.A. (English)

December 1973

Approved:

Departmental Advisor _____ Date _____

R 001 132

ABSTRACT

This study--"The Public Library's Publicity Program: How Do Those Involved View It?" by John D. Rugg--asks what librarians and newsmen think about the basic content and usual quality of the library publicity program, and how their views differ. In addition to a search of library and public relations literature, the author surveyed a group of public libraries, newspapers, and radio and television stations in Ohio, soliciting opinions on what Ohio public libraries are doing, and how well, in the realm of publicity.

Results indicated that there is little disagreement between the librarians and the newsmen, all groups reporting that public libraries in Ohio are doing less well with publicity than they should. In the main, public library publicity is shown to tend to be print oriented; thus it proves somewhat more effective with newspapers than with the electronic media of radio and television. Most commonly provided library publicity services to Ohio news media were reported to be the written news release (92 percent of cases), continuing library-media contact (55 percent), and provision of news tips (47 percent) and background information (also 47 percent).

Some indication was shown that, while public libraries take advantage of public service time on radio and television, additional effort to focus public library messages through the electronic media would reach fertile territory for communicating with the mass public.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iii

PREFACE iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SEARCHING THE LITERATURE 4

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 19

IV. DATA ANALYSIS: WHAT SOME OHIO PUBLIC LIBRARIANS AND NEWS-MEDIA REPORTERS SAY ABOUT LIBRARY PUBLICITY PROGRAMS 29

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 39

Appendix

A. Letter and Questionnaire for Public Libraries 45

B. Letter and Questionnaire for Newspapers 50

C. Questionnaire for Radio and Television Stations 54

D. Some Selected Comments by Survey Responders 57

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 61

LIST OF TABLES

1. Ohio Newspapers Selected to Receive Questionnaires 21

2. Ohio Public Libraries Selected to Receive Questionnaires . 22

3. Ohio Television Stations Selected to Receive Questionnaires 24

4. Ohio Radio Stations Selected to Receive Questionnaires . . 25

5. Actual Library Publicity Services Reported Provided or Received 33

6. Ranking of Elements of Ideal Library Publicity Program . . 35

PREFACE

Having been involved in the active practice of public relations for nearly twenty-five years, and with continuing affectionate use of libraries for even longer, the author here combines his two enthusiasms into a single study. Indeed, since the study also involves his native Ohio, still a third enthusiasm might be said to have been added.

While pursuing a career with the United States government, the author directed for a number of years the international public relations program of the U.S. Air Force's Air Weather Service, which, like the library, exists only to serve the needs of its patrons. With this as background, those who review comments made in this paper will perhaps do so from the standpoint that the author is more publicist than librarian.

He wishes to acknowledge his sincere gratitude to his wife, Mildred, for her forebearance during long hours of research and writing; to Dr. Lucile Thorne, whose welcome advice and counsel throughout his months as a library student have been of inestimable value; to Dr. Maurice Marchant, whose comments, suggestions, and advice in helping to frame the study were invaluable; and to the many helpful men and women of Ohio's public libraries, newspapers, and radio and television stations, without whose vital and interesting data this project would not have been possible.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Six blind men once had occasion to examine an elephant, a beast with which none of them was familiar. By chance, one of them touched the huge animal's tail and declared the elephant to be like a rope. A second felt the animal's side; "he is like a wall," he said. He who touched the beast's trunk announced the pachyderm's likeness to a snake; while those who touched leg, ear, and tusk spoke out for the elephant's resemblance to a tree, a palm leaf, and a spear, respectively.

In their differing opinions, these six are representative of all individual and group reactions to any institution, such as a library. In their individual reactions to the elephant, they truly characterize the jungle beast's "public relations" in a manner similar to that in which patrons react to their library, regardless of what type of library it happens to be. Furthermore, the blind men's reactions were brought about by the various aspects of what the elephant <u>was</u>, not by any calculated action or program on the part of the elephant.

If, on the other hand, the elephant--feeling, perhaps, that its trunk was its finest attribute--had contrived to make sure that each of the six touched only the trunk, it would have been carrying out a basic and fundamental kind of public relations program.

Against a background of public relations in its broadest sense, this study will address itself primarily to publicity programs as they

relate to the library. Based on the literature and a survey of a group of librarians and reporters, it will approach the question: What do librarians and newsmen think about the basic content and usual quality of the library publicity program, and how do their views differ?

Because the field of public relations--of which publicity is a part--is so broad and intertwined with such activities as advertising, some limitations are necessary. Consideration will be limited to those actions taken by a library--usually in writing and through a news-media outlet--for the specific purpose of reaching members of the community it serves. Since any service organization like a library must adjust to the needs and demands of its public, it will be assumed for the purposes of this study that the library is meeting its basic responsibilities to provide good, efficient service cheerfully to its patrons. What, then, ought it to be doing to proclaim that fact, to publicize itself?

Writing in 1963, the assistant dean of Michigan State University's College of Communication Arts defined public relations as ". . . the skilled communication of ideas to the various publics with the object of producing a desired result."[1] This communicator went on to point out some of the things public relations is not: advertising, simple publicity, propaganda, lobbying; although some of these activities are closely allied to public relations.[2]

Betty Rice, an experienced library public relations expert, thus defines publicity, the aspect of public relations with which this study will concern itself: ". . . the release of information to the public

---

[1] John E. Marston, The Nature of Public Relations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), p. 5.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

about an institution . . . through channels of communication (newspapers, magazines, radio, television) whose space or time has not been paid for."[3] In the sense that publicity, which Rice in her helpful book has called "the handmaiden of public relations,"[4] consists of the library's attempt to relate itself to its publics and its publics to itself, its various ramifications will be considered here.

To summarize the foregoing, this study will not attempt to deal with the entire broad spectrum of public relations as it relates to the library; it will limit itself to that aspect of library public relations usually referred to as publicity. It will examine in general the aims and intent of such activities, some of the techniques used, some means of evaluating and assessing the results, and a random sampling of the opinions of librarians and reporters on the specifics and effectiveness of library publicity efforts. It will not deal with the library's basic efforts to relate effectively to the public through doing its work well, but only with the library's efforts to tell the public about the library.

---

[3]Betty Rice, Public Relations for Public Libraries (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1972), p. 2.

[4]Ibid.

CHAPTER II

SEARCHING THE LITERATURE

In common with other public institutions which exist to serve the public and which offer themselves for public scrutiny, the library has a long history of public relations, reflected in the literature. In a 1965 Library Journal article, Alice Norton, public relations director of the Westchester Library System, Mount Vernon, New York, pointed out:

> Publicizing the public library is almost as old as the institution itself. John Cotton Dana, not the first library publicist but one of the liveliest, was printing and distributing broadsides and reading lists for the Denver Public Library before he left Denver in 1893. Not until four years later was the term "public relations" to make its first appearance in print . . .[5]

More sophisticated aspects of library publicity did not make an appearance, however, until sometime after the era of John Cotton Dana, as suggested by Hal Golden and Kitty Hanson in a 1960 book on conducting special events:

> Since the end of World War II, the nation's libraries have become some of the most aggressive sponsors of special events. Before that time, the local library had usually been content to concentrate on services for book lovers who came through the doors, with little or no effort directed toward the less-than-avid reader.[6]

The apparent conflict between Norton and Golden and Hanson as to the library's publicity activities prior to World War II would seem to be

---

[5]Alice Norton, "Professional Publicity Services: A 1965 Checklist," Library Journal 90 (September 1, 1965): 3392.

[6]Hal Golden and Kitty Hanson, How to Plan, Produce, and Publicize Special Events (New York: Oceana Publications, 1960), p. 80.

due to a distinction being made by the authors between a program of issuing printed material on the one hand and of staging activities to draw the public to the library on the other hand.

Given the historical nature of the practice of public relations and publicity by libraries, it might be expected that that circumstance would have resulted in a precise, succinct statement of what publicity and public relations tasks ought to be carried on by any library. To the contrary, the 1966 Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems of the American Library Association are, in this regard, couched in rather vague generalities, prefaced by a heading that "good library service requires an effective public relations program."[7] Beyond this, the standards state:

> Public relations begins with a personal approach by every member of the staff to the public, and continues with the promotion of understanding attitudes toward objectives of the library; the dissemination of information regarding operations not readily discernible by the public; and the dissemination of information regarding materials, services, and activities available to the public.
>
> The program should be planned and budgeted for, yet flexible enough to adjust to unforeseen developments. All available communications media should be used to present information regarding the library to the community. The program should be reviewed periodically to ascertain its effectiveness.[8]

Contrasted with this very general dictum to librarians to have and to carry on a program is the following partial blueprint for basic publicity, taken from the public relations literature, rather than that pertaining specifically to librarianship. Its application to a library

---

[7]American Library Association, Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1967), p. 34.

[8]Ibid.

program is interesting, if not obvious. The subject is organizing for publicity:

> Sound organization will have much to do with creating a successful publicity activity. However, . . . it is necessary to determine . . . the extent of the "publicity potential" a company offers . . .
>
> "Publicity Potential" Check List . . . Product Information Publicity . . .
>
> 1. New Products
> 2. Product Applications
> 3. New Uses for Existing Products
> 4. How to Use the Product
> 5. How the Product is Manufactured . . .
>
> . . . Employee Publicity (usually for local release)
>
> 1. Promotions
> 2. Retirements
> 3. Awards
> 4. Participation in Community Events . . .[9]

The company check list contains considerably more items than are quoted here, but it is interesting to note how many "company publicity potentials" may be translated to "library publicity potentials." For example, librarians might consider the publicity potential of 1. New Books; 2. Uses of Books (product applications) or Nonbooks; 3. New Uses for Old Books; 4. How Books Are Used, or How They Are Made. No such aid to library publicists was discovered in library literature.

---

[9]Charles E. St. Thomas, How to Get Industrial and Business Publicity (Philadelphia: Chilton Co., 1956), pp. 18-19.

It became clear as the literature was perused that those who have written on the subject tend to accept, on the whole, either directly or by implication, the basic value of publicity in general. The cautionary notes sounded are few, and most of them echo the mild admonition by St. Thomas that an early necessity is to determine "the degree to which a company wants to capitalize on its predetermined 'publicity potential.'"[10] In the main, writers agree with the public relations practitioner who said that publicity

> . . . can make the difference between a deed that captures the popular fancy and an event lost in the byways of history.
>
> There are 30 mountains in Colorado higher than Pike's Peak, but who knows of Elbert, Blanca, Uncomphagre, Lincoln, Gray, or Torrey? A gold-rush slogan has made Pike's Peak seem taller than its neighbors.
>
> The very same night of the famous Chicago fire, only 300 miles to the north a holocaust at Peshtigo, Wisconsin, took many more lives and destroyed more property, but there were no reporters present in the north woods.[11]

And, it might be added, no one made a release on the Peshtigo fire.

Applied to the library, this simply means that it is not enough to do an effective job of running a good library. Some planned action must be taken to communicate that fact, and others, to the public, the experts continually point out.

Five years ago, a public relations professor wrote: "Business management recognizes the need for establishing public understanding of its policies and practices through public relations programs."[12]

---

[10] Ibid.

[11] Clifford Owsley, "Making the Mountain Taller," Public Relations Journal 17 (November 1961): 19-20.

[12] Bertrand R. Canfield, Public Relations: Principles, Cases, and Problems, 5th ed. (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968), p. 4.

Even the voices of the special library's administrators were added to the general chorus in support of publicity's value; for the problem of the special library, as compared to that of the public library, is simply one of reaching a different "public" and another type of "community," in this case users of the medical library.

In the Handbook of Medical Library Practice for 1956, Mildred Crowe writes:

> Among the important techniques of public relations is publicity, which includes all written communications that go out from the library. Librarians should become proficient in its preparation. The chief purpose of publicity is to promote a realistic knowledge of the library and its good works.[13]

A seldom-mentioned aspect of publicity is also covered by Crowe, who points out that issuance of the usual news releases and announcements is not the sum total of a publicity effort by the library. She urges:

> Careful consideration should be given to every written item that goes out from the librarian's office, whether it be a notice for an overdue book, a request to an administrator for an increase in budget, a memorandum giving instructions to the staff, or a letter of thanks to a donor for a valuable gift . . . it cannot be too strongly impressed upon librarians that study of the techniques of writing is a necessary part of their education.[14]

In addition to material on the subject of publicity's value and its general aspects, the library literature is rich in information on the general and specific conduct of a library's publicity program. A wealth of guidance is available on, for example, when and how to reach out for library publicity. One handbook gives a listing of occasions

---

[13]Mildred R. Crowe, "Public Relations," in Handbook of Medical Library Practice, 2d ed., ed: Janet Doe and Mary Louise Marshall (Chicago: American Library Association, 1956), pp. 253-54.

[14]Ibid., p. 254.

upon which library publicity releases are especially appropriate, a technique known to the publicity writer as selecting a "news peg" upon which to "hang" a publicity story. For the appropriate dates in February, for example, this useful text lists the birthdays of Sidney Lanier (1842), Charles Dickens (1812), John Ruskin (1819), Samuel Pepys (1632), and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807), among others, and records the same month's charter date of the Boy Scouts (1910) and publication date in 1678 of John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress within a lengthy list of suitable occasions for library publicity.[15]

Another down-to-earth, simplified text, not written specifically for librarians, gives some basic tips for those who might be carrying the library's publicity messages to the mass audiences represented by radio and television:

> Some people don't need this coaching, with some it may do more harm than good, but here are a few tips:
>
> 1. An effective speaking tempo.
> 2. Naturalness.
> 3. No nervous gestures.
> 4. Be relaxed.
> 5. No overly long sentences or speeches.[16]

Helpful hints and basic guidance exist in considerable profusion throughout the literature, providing the neophyte library publicist with

---

[15]Marie D. Loizeaux, Publicity Primer, 3d rev. ed. (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1945), p. 84.

[16]Babette Hall, The Right Angles: How to Do Successful Publicity (New York: Ives Washburn, Inc., 1965), p. 87.

a fairly broad range of what-to-do and how-to-do-it instructions in the intricate art of getting the library's message to its community through the medium of a publicity program.

It is neither the function nor the intention of this study to present here a handbook of publicity plans and techniques for use by librarians. It would be quite outside the restricted scope of research time and length to attempt to do so. However, some indications of what material of this nature is to be found in the library literature seems appropriate for inclusion in this paper. In discussing possible forms of publicity, for example, Crowe states:

> Chief among the library's forms of publicity are reports. Every library should make some form of annual report to its patrons. . . . items to be included . . . are: book collection, size and gaps if advisable; use of library, circulation, and attendance; acquisition statistics; . . . staff information; budget; equipment added; . . . work of special departments; and plans for the future.[17]

Additional suggestions are also made in Crowe's discussion for the development of "library communications," including:

> All correspondence should be answered promptly. Long delays are inexcusable. . . .
>
> All communications should be cordial. Terseness and sharpness are unnecessary even when dealing with the most recalcitrant borrower. . . .
>
> Announcements calling attention to a special item of the library's bookstock or service should be timely, informative and interesting.
>
> Statistics are an important part of library publicity. . . .
>
> It may be helpful if a library can issue periodic newsletters, informing patrons of developments . . .
>
> Interesting items of information pertaining to the library may be sent to local newspapers, county or state professional publications, or to the house organ or the alumni bulletin of

---

[17]Crowe, p. 254.

> the organization of which the library is a part. These newspaper and periodical notices should be succinct and interesting, calling attention to a particular phase of the library's work. Human interest stories about the library are often successful in obtaining help for it. They should be written in attractive, narrative fashion and should be accompanied by photographs. The library's historical collection, its value to its patrons, its ability to find the impossible, a recent outstanding acquisition, and its direst needs are subjects that best fit this type of publicity. The response to such articles often dramatically proves the power of the press.[18]

In the ABC's of Library Promotion, Steve Sherman points out yet another aspect of library publicity possibilities, the availability of public service time on radio and television for library messages. Such time must be made available in the public interest as a matter of a compliance with the law by radio and television broadcasters. "In actuality," Sherman says, "many stations are not granted licenses as a result of inadequate programming in the public interest."[19] This is not to say that time is automatically available to librarians per se; but

> The law promotes public service programming. The Federal Communications Commission favors educational programs. The library is the most all-encompassing educational institution. Public service time is available, . . . must go to somebody. Why shouldn't the time go to librarians?[20]

In this same connection, Frances Nunmaker, in a 1948 text on use by libraries of radio's mass audience, tells of a

> . . . program called "Libraryana," in which unusual reference questions are featured. There are good human interest stories in connection with Ohio's bookmobiles and programs telling about this type of library service bring a good response. On one occasion, the Clark County bookmobile came to Columbus and was parked in front of the radio station. A "line" was dropped from the station into the bookmobile and

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 255-56.

[19] Steve Sherman, ABC's of Library Promotion (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971), p. 46.

[20] Ibid.

> two men from WHKC did an ad-lib broadcast directly from the bookmobile, interviewing people who were inspecting the library on wheels . . .[21]

It is interesting to note that Nunmaker, who at that time was publicity director of the Ohio State Library, gathered the comments of a number of radio station managers, one of the few instances in library literature to report an attempt to evaluate a library's publicity program. One of the managers, speaking of a historical radio series, said:

> . . . We had occasion to use the library many times in preparing scripts for that series;. . . we refer to the library very often for script material. The cooperation of the local library is splendid. Now by inverse ratio the utilization of radio by local libraries is practically nil. In short, we have had several occasions to use the resources of the library, but the library apparently has had no reason to use our facilities.[22]

Since this comment dates from an era a quarter-century ago in which radio was quite different from what it is today, its specific relevance perhaps is not great; but librarians who have small local television outlets at hand might do well to translate the concept of that comment from the older broadcast medium to the newer.

Another medium for the purveying of the library's publicity message is the exhibit or display. Librarian Joan Titley of the Kornhauser Health Sciences Library at Kentucky's University of Louisville, had this to say about exhibits:

> Exhibits displayed on a bulletin board or in a case in the foyer or entrance of the library give the public samples of the library's wares. Exhibits fall into five categories: historical, biographical, factual, commemorative, and current events. More important than the topic is its relevance and pertinence--to a guest lecturer, a holiday, new buildings,

---

[21]Frances G. Nunmaker, The Library Broadcasts (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1948), p. 40.

[22]Ibid., pp. 41-42.

> graduation, or registration, for example. Topical exhibits and displays show the patron that the library is alert, that the staff is cognizant of the institution's activities, and that the library's collection and services relate to the interests of the users . . .[23]

However, as in all other endeavors, what is worth doing in the preparation and display of exhibits is worth doing well. Rice points out to library exhibitors:

> Look at the bulletin boards, the display cases, the lounge areas. How would they strike you if you had never visited your library before? Do they convey a sense of lively activity, pleasant welcome, a "with it" aura, or do they perpetuate the stereotype of the library as a dingy place populated by individuals more interested in preserving the books than in serving the patrons? If you can't manage to have a good-looking community bulletin board, don't have one. . . . If you cannot assign personnel to change the display cases on a regular basis, seriously consider soliciting outside professional help.[24]

So much has been published on the mechanics of preparation and distribution of the bulwark of the publicity program--the written news release--that it would serve no worth-while purpose here to do more than touch briefly upon the subject. Help in this regard is available for those who wish to improve their proficiency in the written aspects of publicity work for the library. Not the least of these sources of aid and instruction is to be found in the columns of the local newspaper; all of the great variety of material there was written in such a manner as to lead the editors to decide to print it. It bears study.

One recent article on the art of publicity getting appeared in 1969, written by the public relations director of the Seattle Public Library, Elizabeth Wright Evans. She covered the news release from

---

[23]Joan Titley, "The Library and Its Publics: Identification and Communications," in Handbook of Medical Library Practice, 3d ed., ed: Gertrude L. Annan and Jacqueline W. Felter (Chicago: Medical Library Association, 1970), p. 361.

[24]Rice, p. 21.

the type of paper to be used to the matter of accompanying photographs. Evans' excellent article points out that it is

> . . . important to study the media which we wish to use. By reading all departments of the newspaper, noting particular styles and ways of writing articles, we can come to write material that will be suitable and will run almost as we wrote it. For instance, if we know the kind of abbreviation the paper uses for words like avenue and street or a.m. and p.m., we do better. . . .
>
> About photographs, they should be glossy finish. In the case of facial photos, known as "head shots," these may be five by seven inches. For pictures with more persons they generally are eight by ten inches. But some papers want the pictures to be exactly the size in which they will appear; this is because they use a different printing process. Thus it is wise to inquire of the particular publication what size it wants.[25]

On this same subject, Loizeaus's fine book provides added guidance:

> If we are to please the editor, we have several MUSTS thrust upon us. He MUST get "clean" copy, so we will:
>
> TYPEWRITE if possible (and let's make it possible!). Never, we have been told, use pen and ink. If long hand is absolutely unavoidable, use black pencil and print all names.[26]

Additional valid admonitions follow, ranging from writing on only one side of the paper to a request for generous margins and prohibitions against hyphenating words at the ends of lines or dividing paragraphs from one page to the next.[27]

On the important matter of assessing and evaluating the content and results of library public relations or publicity programs, library literature is thin. One article, while interesting, actually was a report of librarians' reactions to a public information program run on a state-wide basis in Louisiana by professional publicists under Title I

---

[25]Elizabeth Wright Evans, "How to Get Publicity for YOUR Library," Library News Bulletin 36 (October 1969): 260-61.

[26]Loizeaux, p. 25.

[27]Ibid., pp. 25-26.

of the Library Services and Construction Act. The question that was asked of participating Louisiana librarians was whether or not they recognized ". . . the value of employing professionals in the public relations field."[28] Although resulting comments were mixed,

> Individual responses to questionnaires indicated that they recognized the importance of using all media--radio, television and newspaper, and that the use of all media can be more effectively coordinated by public relations representatives at the regional level. Their ability to work with the large daily newspapers, TV stations and radio stations serving surrounding communities is a decided asset.[29]

Some pertinent comments were:

> I see no need to spend taxpayers' money on something we can do ourselves.
>
> A public relations firm has the know-how and contacts to reach the public. They have the time and talent which most librarians do not have.
>
> For general publicity I would prefer writing my own news stories, since it is almost as easy to write a story as it is to list the facts necessary for someone else.
>
> We were relieved of duties pertinent to publicity and were able to devote more time to actual library processes.[30]

Another publicity evaluation found in the literature consisted of an assessment of a Wisconsin program called the Cooperative Library Information Program (CLIP), reported in the Wisconsin Library Bulletin in 1971. Developed under Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act, CLIP was intended "to perform certain functions at the state level that could not be adequately handled by individual libraries

---

[28]Betty Edgerton, "Public Information Regional Projects: An Assessment," Louisiana Library Association Bulletin 32 (Fall 1969): 99.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid., pp. 98-99.

or systems . . . and to assist local librarians in developing their own public information programs through the exchange of ideas and useful materials."[31] Following completion of the nine-month test program, the administrators took stock of what had been accomplished by the statewide cooperative CLIP activities. They reported that

> . . . there is no tangible measure. True, we can quote some facts and figures: 20,000 attractive, colorful book list covers were distributed in quantity to libraries requesting them; 650 library staff members around the state are sporting a button that reads "May I Help?"; 300 library walls are plastered with a poster reading "No Silence," designed to destroy an outmoded image.
>
> Nine commercial television stations have a set of six colorful spot announcements calling attention to libraries and their services; 115 radio stations have discs of 15 recorded spot announcements. The slogan "Discover Libraries" has been adopted and publicized, and a universal library symbol has been designed and made available for all to use. Three issues of a newsletter, Tips from CLIP, have been published--informing, exhorting, cajoling, and offering. . . .[32]

One chapter in Sherman's excellent handbook on library promotion is devoted to evaluation of the public relations program. He urges all library publicists to study the needs of their library, analyze those communication channels available, pretest publicity materials, determine media response, and compile people's response to publicity messages. A framework for this evaluation process is set forth in a series of basic questions to be asked, ranging from "Is your library aware of current needs of your service area?" through "Did the professionals compliment you on your presentation of the material?" and "Did the media use the material you submitted?" to "Did a particular piece of PR material

---

[31] Marian S. Edsall, "CLIP--The First Nine Months," Wisconsin Library Bulletin 67 (March-April 1971): 93.

[32] Ibid.

temporarily attract an unusual number of people to the library?"[33]

Sherman's recommendations are for a continuing program of analysis and evaluation, using a subjective approach, as a library's publicity program is planned, implemented, and reviewed. Although few, if any, meaningful quantitative statistics can be expected to result from this approach, the procedure can yield real dividends in terms of improved effectiveness in the publicity program.

It has been suggested that no more can be expected, but some of the public relations experts are hopeful. Writing in 1969, John F. Budd, Jr., a Carl Byoir & Associates vice president, and Robert G. Strayton, a Honeywell Corporation public relations man, looked somewhat hopefully to the future:

> There's no disputing the fact that the Achilles heel of many a public relations operation is the weak feedback . . . of results, and their evaluation. What tangible evidence is accumulated, i.e., newspaper and magazine clippings, is puny documentation of the worth of a major investment such as public relations.
>
> Because public relations has for too long been largely intuitive, it perhaps has an especially pressing need for more scientific inputs, for incorporating in its modus operandi more orderliness and precision. However lean the body of knowledge is in understanding people's reactions, attitudes and opinions, public relations has an obligation to use the best of it and to apply it to its myriad activities to get some measure of impact, even if it isn't conclusive.[34]

In partial response to this obvious and expressed need for some expert evaluation of the quality and content of the library's publicity program, this study will attempt to dip into the reservoir of opinions

---

[33]Sherman, pp. 122-32.

[34]John F. Budd, Jr., and Robert G. Strayton, "Can Public Relations Be Measured?" Public Relations Quarterly 13 (Winter 1969): 19.

and attitudes on the subject which are held by those groups which are most closely concerned--librarians, newspaper reporters, and radio and television newsmen. The results may be, as Budd and Strayton suggest, "puny documentation;" but the indications reflected thereby can be expected to be more helpful to librarians seeking to improve the quality of their publicity programs than no data at all.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In approaching the basic problem of setting up an appropriate method for collecting and analyzing representative data which would reflect informed opinions on the content and quality of the library publicity program in general, it was apparent from the outset that neither time nor financial support was sufficient to permit taking a national survey. Such a desirable extension of basic research would have to wait for some future time. It was determined, therefore, that what this initial study would seek to reflect would be some indicative opinions and attitudes on public library publicity programs drawn from some randomly sampled members of interested and informed groups within a single state of the United States.

The midwestern state of Ohio was selected for the basic survey, partially upon the basis of the author's interest and knowledge as a native Ohioan and partially because, while having a lengthy history of library service, Ohio is neither so sparsely populated as some of the Western states nor so compacted with people as are some of the more metropolitan areas of the United States. Ohioans, who in the 1970 Federal Census numbered nearly 11 million,[35] are domiciled--and served by libraries--in groupings ranging from rural to urban, and informed by

---

[35] Ayer Directory of Publications, 1973 (Philadelphia: Ayer Press, 1973), p. 658.

more than 400 newspapers,[36] 26 commercial television stations,[37] and 120 radio stations,[38] exclusive of FM stations carrying principally music.

In order to attempt to avoid surveying those who had little or no involvement with public library publicity, only those Ohio towns which had a population of 25,000 or greater and in which a newspaper was published were selected for the survey population. This delimitation resulted in the selection of 33 Ohio cities and towns, based upon their respective listings in the referenced Ayer's directory, 16 of which communities had only a daily newspaper, 5 of which had only a newspaper published less frequently than every day, and 12 of which had newspapers in both of the two categories mentioned. From among this number, 26 newspapers were selected by lot to receive questionnaires, a number which represented nearly 58 percent of the total population. Rationale for a sample size of 26 will be explained in a later paragraph. In the selection of newspapers to be surveyed, it was further decided, in order to broaden the data base by maximizing the number of different Ohio communities to be surveyed, that no more than a single newspaper in any one city or town would be surveyed. The newspapers selected for the survey, with their respective circulation figures as given in Ayer's, are listed in Table 1, which also indicates whether or not a particular newspaper returned a completed questionnaire in time to have its data included in the final data base of the survey results.

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Broadcasting Yearbook, 1973 (Washington, D.C.: Broadcasting Publications, Inc., 1973), pp. A-41-43.

[38] Ibid., pp. B-151-59.

TABLE 1

OHIO NEWSPAPERS SELECTED TO RECEIVE QUESTIONNAIRES[39]

* indicates inclusion of data in survey results

I. Dailies: (with 1972 circulation figures)

Akron Beacon-Journal	178,377
*Canton Repository	70,223
*Cincinnati Enquirer	194,248
Dayton Journal Herald (returned blank)	113,870
*Elyria Chronicle-Telegram	32,962
Fairborn Herald (returned too late)	8,257
*Hamilton Journal-News	30,288
Lancaster Eagle-Gazette	19,148
*Lima News	42,792
Lorain Journal	40,498
*Mansfield News-Journal	39,345
*Marion Star	23,590
*Massillon Independent	21,712
*Newark Advocate and American Tribune	24,361
*Portsmouth Times	24,074
*Toledo Blade	172,491
*Warren Tribune-Chronicle	42,263
*Youngstown Vindicator	102,626
*Zanesville Times Recorder	31,437
Mean circulation of dailies which returned completed questionnaires	60,886

II. Weeklies: (with 1972 circulation figures)

*Euclid News-Journal	11,198
*Columbus Tri-Village News	6,670
Cuyahoga Falls Falls News	4,800
*Lakewood Sun-Post	13,564
Maple Heights Press	5,200
*Mentor Monitor	3,691
*Springfield News-Sun	44,854
Mean circulation of weeklies which returned completed questionnaires	14,795
Mean circulation of all papers which returned completed questionnaires	48,757

[39] Ayer Directory, pp. 659-85.

Reasoning that the public library is more likely to be involved with its area's news media than are other library types, 26 Ohio public libraries were selected by lot. This was done by writing on identical slips of paper the names of the 33 towns which met the stated criteria of 25,000 or more population and a newspaper. Placed in a container, slips were drawn at random, replacing drawn slips after recording, until 26 different towns had been selected. A questionnaire was sent to each such town's public library.[40] The 26 public libraries selected for the survey are listed in table 2, along with an indication as to whether or not a given library returned its questionnaire and thus contributed to the survey data.

TABLE 2

OHIO PUBLIC LIBRARIES SELECTED TO RECEIVE QUESTIONNAIRES[41]

* indicates inclusion of data in survey results

*Akron Public Library
Rodman Public Library, Alliance
*Barberton Public Library
*Cleveland Public Library
*Columbus Public Library
*Taylor Memorial Public Library, Cuyahoga Falls
*Dayton and Montgomery County Public Library
*Elyria Public Library
*Findlay Public Library
*Lakewood Public Library
Fairfield County District Library, Lancaster
*Lima Public Library
*Lorain Public Library
*Mansfield Public Library
Marion Carnegie Public Library
*Massillon Public Library

[40] American Library Directory, 1972-73 (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1972), pp. 739-81.

[41] Ibid.

TABLE 2--Continued

*Mentor Public Library
Middletown Free Public Library
*Newark Public Library
*Portsmouth Public Library
*Warder District Library of Clark County, Springfield
Public Library of Steubenville and Jefferson County
*Toledo-Lucas County Public Library
*Warren Public Library
*Greene County District Library, Xenia
*Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County

In the case of the television stations selected for questioning in the survey, the selection was delimited to the extent of including only commercial television stations operated for profit and subject to the Federal requirement to carry a specific amount of public service programming in order to retain their license. No educational television stations were included in the sample; since such stations might well be expected to reflect a biased point of view toward libraries as fellow laborers in the educational vineyards, resulting in a more sympathetic approach which would tend to inflate the evaluations involved. In the final analysis, this technique resulted in a population of television stations of 26 for Ohio,[42] which was selected as the sample size for each of the four survey subgroups--libraries, newspapers, television stations, and radio stations--to receive questionnaires. In the case of Ohio television stations, this resulted in a sample which was 100 percent of the population. Table 3 lists the television stations which were sent questionnaires, as well as which stations returned them.

[42] Broadcasting Yearbook, pp. A-41-43.

TABLE 3

OHIO TELEVISION STATIONS SELECTED TO RECEIVE QUESTIONNAIRES[43]

* indicates inclusion of data in survey results

*WAKR-TV, Akron
WJAN, Canton
*WCPO-TV, Cincinnati
*WKRC-TV, Cincinnati
WLWT, Cincinnati
*WXIX-TV, Cincinnati
*WEWS, Cleveland
*WJW-TV, Cleveland
*WKBF-TV, Euclid
*WKYC-TV, Cleveland
*WUAB, Cleveland
WBNS-TV, Columbus
*WLWC, Columbus
*WTVN-TV, Columbus
WHIO-TV, Dayton
WKEF, Dayton
WLWD, Dayton
*WLIO, Lima
WSTV-TV, Steubenville
WDHO-TV, Toledo
*WSPD-TV, Toledo
*WTOL-TV, Toledo
*WFMJ-TV, Youngstown
WKBN-TV, Youngstown
WYTV, Youngstown
WHIZ-TV, Zanesville

The final group of those to be surveyed on the subject of the library's publicity program was made up of the commercial radio stations throughout the state of Ohio. Since many of the frequency modulation (FM) stations are associated with AM stations and follow programming formats--i.e., chiefly music--not entirely appropriate for most library programs, all Ohio FM stations were eliminated from the population for

[43] Ibid.

the survey. A total of 120 radio stations[44] remained in the survey population, from which 26 were selected by lot to receive questionnaires. This number represented some 22 percent of the population, the smallest percentage of any of the four subgroups. Listed in table 4 are the Ohio radio stations which received survey questionnaires, with an indication of which of them returned them for inclusion in the data base for the survey.

TABLE 4

OHIO RADIO STATIONS SELECTED TO RECEIVE QUESTIONNAIRES[45]

* indicates inclusion of data in survey results

*WFAH, Alliance
*WNCO, Ashland
WATH, Athens
*WTOO, Bellefontaine
*WMGS, Bowling Green
*WHOT, Youngstown
WINW, Canton
*WCSM, Celina
*WKRC, Cincinnati
WGAR, Cleveland
WIXY, Cleveland
*WRFD, Columbus
*WAVI, Dayton
*WSRW, Hillsboro
WKNT, Kent
*WBRJ, Marietta
*WMPO, Middleport
*WPFB, Middletown
*WCLT, Newark
WPAY, Portsmouth
*WMVR, Sidney
WTOD, Toledo
*WERT, Van Wert
*WCHO, Washington Court House
*WWST, Wooster
*WKBN, Youngstown

[44] Ibid., pp. B-151-59.

[45] Ibid.

Concurrent with development of a random-sample mailing list of public libraries and news-media facilities--newspapers, radio and television stations--which might be expected to be concerned with the content and quality of the public library's publicity program, a brief questionnaire was prepared. It was directed at a determination of a number of aspects of the library's publicity efforts, as viewed by the librarians on the one hand and by the news-media representatives on the other. Furthermore, it was set up with a view to comparison of sampled views of reporters for printed and for electronic media, which is to say radio and television. It was expected that such a comparison pattern would reflect that librarians tend to do better for some media than for others and have differing views from the news media on the adequacy or excellence of the average publicity program.

Basically, the questionnaire, consisting of ten questions and a space for additional comments, addressed itself to establishment of the responder's credentials and experience level, solicitation of profiles of the types of publicity services actually provided and those which were considered to be ideal, opinions of frequency and adequacy of use of library-issued materials, and evaluations of the quality of written material issued by the library and of its over-all publicity program.

Each responder was asked to indicate whether or not he had the responsibility for issuance--in the case of librarians--or use--in the case of news media--of library publicity material, whether he had had such responsibility in an earlier position, and whether the total of experience in such duties was less than a year, one to five years, or more than five years. Other than coding each questionnaire to reflect

which of the four survey subgroups the responses represented, no other identification questions were included.

Each responder was then asked to indicate which of the listed possible publicity services was "a normal part of your library's continuing publicity program:" written news releases, photographic items, occasional verbal tips or leads on news stories, continuing contact with reporters, suggestions for feature stories or radio or television programs, suggestions of people to be interviewed, news conferences, provision of background information to reporters, or "other" services. The following questions then asked each responder to indicate which of the listed services the responder felt ought to be a part of the basic publicity program of every public library.

Opinions of responders were solicited in the following questions as to whether the library or the news-media outlet usually initiated a contact between the two agencies, how frequently library-issued publicity material appeared to be used by the media, whether or not libraries normally make use of public service time on broadcast media, and if and why the library received equitable coverage in newspaper columns.

Finally, on a range of "Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor," each was asked to rate the quality of library-issued written material, and on a range of "Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Virtually Nonexistent," each was asked to rate the "library publicity program of the public library or libraries you have known?"

Following completion of the questionnaire format, it was pretested on members of the staff at the Provo Public Library here and on graduate students in library science at Brigham Young University. A

few minor readjustments in question phrasing resulted from the comments made by those who participated in the pretest.

In an attempt to increase the number of completed questionnaires returned--since librarians receive many such questionnaires and they and news reporters have more pressing deadlines to meet--a dime was included with each questionnaire to buy coffee for the responder while completing and mailing the questionnaire. It is interesting to note that eleven of the responders--four librarians, three newspaper reporters, three television reporters, and one radio reporter--returned the dime, one of the librarians with the comment that it should be used to mail a copy of the results of the survey to that library.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS: WHAT SOME OHIO PUBLIC LIBRARIANS AND NEWS-MEDIA REPORTERS SAY ABOUT LIBRARY PUBLICITY PROGRAMS

Survey questionnaires (see appendices), sent out with the usual self-addressed, stamped envelope in late September, were returned over the period of nearly four weeks in October 1973, until a total of 76 questionnaires of the 104 sent out had been received. Of this number, one (from a large metropolitan daily newspaper) was returned blank, and another (from a smaller daily newspaper) was received too late for its data to be included. Thus, a total sample size of 74 responders makes up the data analyzed in this chapter.

Of those 74 data-producing questionnaires, 21 were received from librarians, 19 from newspapers, 19 from radio stations, and 15 from television stations. Data analyzed, therefore, is almost equally the responses of each of the subgroups surveyed--approximately 28 percent of the replies represent libraries, 25 percent each reflect radio stations and newspapers, and 22 percent reveal the opinions of television newsmen.

All of those who returned a questionnaire reported that they were the responsible person within their organization for issuing (on the part of librarians) or using (on the part of news reporters) the library's publicity material. Furthermore, responses came from those who have a considerable amount of experience in dealing with library

publicity and news coverage: 58 percent of those responding reported more than five years' experience with library news, and nearly 33 percent have between one and five years of such experience.

Although it was anticipated prior to circulation of the survey questionnaire that there would be a divergence of opinion between the librarians and the news-media reporters on the matter of which of the two groups was most likely to initiate contact, such divergence did not prove out in the replies received. It was expected that most librarians would feel that they were taking the initiative, while most reporters would report that the initiative was theirs. In fact, however, the news media agreed (40 percent of media replies) with the librarians (52 percent of library replies) that the initiative was more likely to come from the library than from the news room. Many of those responding to that question, however, reported the opinion--held by 47 percent--that the initiative could come from either direction.

The question was asked of each responder: "How frequently, in your experience, does . . . library-released material appear to be used by the news media . . . ?" or, in the case of the media, "How frequently . . . (are you) able to use" library-issued material? Of the entire sample, more than two-thirds (69 percent) replied either "nearly always" or "usually," a response which was reflected by the librarians, 67 percent of whom indicated the same two choices. It is interesting to note that all of the newspapers replying reported a belief that such library material was used "nearly always" or "usually," while slightly more than 45 percent of the electronic-media reporters (radio and television) set down an opinion that "occasionally" or "often" are the proper terms to

describe their use of library publicity efforts. Furthermore, a total of 11 of the 33 electronic-media responses to that question--exactly a third of the radio-television sample--selected the "occasionally" used option. The remaining possible response was "almost never," which was marked by only one responder--a librarian--in the entire sample of 74.

As most librarians are aware, a certain portion of each radio and television station's on-the-air time must be devoted to broadcasting of public-service programming--a category which includes programs on and news about public libraries--in order to retain its license to operate. In asking all responders except the newspaper sample, which is not concerned with public-service time, whether and how much the library made use of this communication channel, possible replies were that it was not used, that it was used occasionally, or that it was used frequently. In this regard, 52 percent of the librarians against only 30 percent of the electronic-media reporters reported "frequent" use of public-service on-the-air time. Of the librarians, 33 percent marked "occasional" use; 50 percent of the radio-television reporters agreed with this choice. Two facts of the survey need to be considered here, aside from the very small size of the sample: 1) no attempt was made to match communities in the sample subgroups, and 2) all of the commercial television stations are included in the sample; although only 58 percent of them are represented in the data base. Furthermore, despite the disparity--a semantic one, possibly--between library and news room opinions on Ohio use of public-service time, only 15 percent of the librarians polled and 20 percent of the electronic reporters indicated no use of such time. In this connection, some of the comments received from radio and tele-

vision newsmen are pertinent: "Our relationship with the library is good, but could be much better," says one TV newsman, "if the time between an idea and execution of it for a public service announcement or program could be shortened." From a radio reporter: "Libraries should take more advantage of public service time. Most information on a day-to-day basis from libraries does not fall into the category of radio news." Another radio station, in replying "yes, occasionally" to the use-of-public-service-time question, added "not as much as they should."

A similar query was posed to librarians and newspapers only, as to whether or not it was felt that the public library receives an equitable amount of coverage in the local newspaper. The question turned out to be faulty to the extent of not providing all possible answers, thus the resulting data is somewhat suspect. While possible choices to this question included "no" and "yes, largely due to library's publicity program" and "yes, largely due to newspaper's interest," no option for "yes, due equally to library and newspaper" was available. As a result, three responders checked both "yes" options and one commented on the need for an additional response. Although it had been expected that considerable divergence of opinion would be reflected here, the two groups were in virtual agreement. Slightly more librarians (38 percent) than newspapers (32 percent) reported a lack of equitable coverage. As to who was responsible for the coverage received, 43 percent of surveyed librarians credited the equitable coverage to the library's efforts and less than 10 percent to the newspaper's interest. On the newspaper side, 32 percent credited equitable coverage to the newspaper and another 32

percent to the library's publicity program. Two librarians (10 percent) and one newspaper (5 percent) wanted the credit divided equally.

In the opinion of the surveyor, the central aspect of the study lay in the solicitation of opinions from librarians and reporters on the usual and the ideal elements of the library publicity program. Each of the responders was asked to indicate which of the following aspects of a publicity program were normally a part of the program of the library or libraries with which he was familiar: written news releases, photographic items, occasional verbal tips or leads on news stories, continuing contact between library and media staff, suggestions for possible news features or radio-television programs, suggestions of possible interviewees, news conferences, provision of background information, or some other unspecified services. Following this, each was asked to indicate which of the publicity services were considered to be an essential part of the basic program of every public library. Responders were not asked to rate the items as to relative importance or value.

TABLE 5

ACTUAL LIBRARY PUBLICITY SERVICES REPORTED PROVIDED OR RECEIVED

Services	Libraries	Newspapers	Radio	Television	Total
Releases	20	19	17	12	68
Photos	14	8	1	6	29
News Tips	14	12	3	6	35
Contact	20	13	5	3	41
Feature Ideas	16	10	3	3	32
Interviewees	8	3	4	5	20
Conferences	4	1	5	8	18
Background	17	9	6	3	35
Other	6	4	1	3	14

From the table it may be seen that the most commonly provided publicity services tend to be the traditional ones of written news releases (nearly 92 percent of the sample), continuing library-media contact (55 percent of the sample), and provision of news tips on the one hand and background information on the other (47 percent each). It is interesting to note that photographs--which are shown to be somewhat less common than would be the case if radio stations, who cannot use them, were eliminated from the sample--are being received by one of the radio stations, despite their uselessness to an auditory medium. On the other hand, television stations, which are a visual medium, report the receipt of photographic items in only 40 percent of the cases--6 out of 15 stations which replied.

Although the present sample is too small and too restricted in area of coverage to reflect more than indications, results tend to bear out the common complaint by nonprint journalists that public relations workers service the electronic media of radio and television as if they were servicing newspapers. It is perhaps not surprising if librarians are print oriented, but television and radio newsmen must deplore any such tendency. Survey results reflect the following ranking (in descending order of frequency) for publicity services: releases, contact, tips, background data, feature ideas, photographs, interviewees, conferences; simply reversing background data and feature ideas will convert this list to the ranking assigned by the newspaper subgroup. In this regard, a comment from a radio responder is pertinent: "Radio and TV hungers for feature items which libraries are in a position to provide." Wise librarians will take heed of the admonition of that newsman.

Responders not only provided a profile of library publicity they receive, or issue; but they also provided profiles of those services which they consider to be part of an "ideal" library publicity program. A total of three--two television newsmen and a librarian--did not reply to that part of the questionnaire, thereby reducing the sample to 71. Also, some ambiguity in the instructions apparently resulted in some degree of reduced significance in the validity of that data, caused by a few obvious errors in responses to that question. Despite this, some interesting indications are worth noting. Table 6 details in descending order of importance the ranking which can be assigned to the publicity services listed in the questionnaire on the basis of respective numbers within each subgroup who checked that service as one which should be a part of the public library's "ideal" publicity program.

TABLE 6

RANKING OF ELEMENTS OF IDEAL LIBRARY PUBLICITY PROGRAM

Most frequent is listed first; single spacing shows equal rankings

Newspapers	Radio	Television	All Media	Libraries
releases	program ideas	interviewees	releases	releases
news tips		releases	ideas	contact
contact	interview	news tips	news tips	ideas
feature ideas	releases	prog ideas	interviewees	photos
photographs	news tips	background	contact	background
background	contact	conferences	background	news tips
interviewees	confer-ences	contact photos	conferences	interviewees
conferences	background	other	photos	conferences
other	other		other	other
	photos			

It can be seen from a comparison of the profiles given for the librarians and the composite of all media, including newspapers, radio and television stations, that librarians tend to place somewhat more emphasis on photographs than do the media representatives and somewhat less emphasis on news tips and suggested interviewees than those their program is servicing. Again, this discrepancy may be due to inclusion in the sample of non-photograph-using radio stations; otherwise, the "ideal" profiles are reasonable matches. It is noted, however, that the electronic media place less emphasis on continuing contact by libraries than do the other two subgroups, libraries and newspapers. Suggestions for interviewees rank high on radio and television profiles, as do ideas for programs. News conferences--popular with many top administrators in all fields, but regarded by most public relations workers as not overly productive--rank universally low on the profiles of all four subgroups. Written news releases, on the other hand, long the standby of publicity programs, rank near the top on all the profiles.

In addition to analysis of the individual services which each of the groups regarded as important, the number of services in the actual and the "ideal" programs of responders were analyzed. Of the sample of 71, since three questionnaires reflected no "ideal" program content, 11 percent wanted two services, 15 percent wanted three, 18 percent wanted four, 19 percent five, 8 percent six, 9 percent seven, 11 percent eight, and 5 percent nine services. Thus, there was no indicated significance in the number of publicity services considered necessary. It must be noted, however, that 24 percent of the librarians believed eight services were optimum; 21 percent of the newspapers each selected two, four, and

six services as most desirable; 37 percent of the radio stations voted for a three-service program; and 27 percent of the television stations indicated a need for four services.

How do librarians and news-media representatives feel about the quality of the library's publicity program? Each questionnaire requested an evaluation of the "public library or libraries you have known" on a five-point scale of Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Virtually Nonexistent. Since some responders wished to rate between those values, post-adjustment of responses added intervening values of Very Good, Fairly Good, Fairly Poor, and Very Poor. A total of 38 percent of the sample rated the program Fair and another 27 percent rated it Good. The mean value of the 74-member sample's rating fell halfway between Fair and Fairly Good--the mean was 4.57 and 4 was Fairly Good and 5 was Fair.

In the 21-member librarian sample subgroup, the mean was somewhat higher--4.05, which equates to Fairly Good. A Good rating was assigned by 43 percent of the librarians, a Fair rating by 33 percent.

Nine of the 19 newspapers rated the library's publicity program as Fair (47 percent); and five newspapers rated it Good, for a mean of 3.95 (Fairly Good), nearly identical with the librarians' rating. In the radio stations, 42 percent (8 stations) assigned Poor as their overall rating; 32 percent said Fair; only 16 percent said Good. The mean for radio newsmen fell at 5.37, midway between Fair and Fairly Poor. In the television newsrooms, the library fared somewhat better: 40 percent said Fair, 20 percent Good. The television mean rating was 5.07 (Fair). Similar respective results were noted in the requested rating of the quality of written publicity material issued by the public library.

In this final evaluative analysis, in which it had been at the outset expected that there would be a significant divergence of results from the two basic groups of librarians and newsmen, the chi-square test was applied to measure significance at the five-percent level. No such significance could be shown; for the resulting value fell far short of that required for significance at that confidence level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although the results achieved by this initial study cannot be termed in any way conclusive--and are not presented as being so--they represent, at least, some indications about the desirable content and the estimated quality of the public library's publicity program. As such, the results may prove helpful to interested librarians who are concerned about the future of that important aspect of the work of the library. Little evidence is found that publicity and public relations for the library is considered by any to be unimportant; it is surely a reasonable assumption that, in this age of increasingly difficult and strenuous competition for the public interest and the public dollar, it will grow more important, not less, as time goes on.

A search of the pertinent, recent literature--both the library literature and that generated by public relations practitioners who are not associated with library work--reveals a consistent belief in the value of public relations-publicity programs. In the case of the public relations practitioner, this attitude is hardly unexpected; a man is seldom disposed to question his daily bread. On the part of librarians engaged in part-time library publicity work, however, when the unfamiliar chores of publicity steal time from the affairs of librarianship, this recognition of the value of public relations is less suspect. Results of the Louisiana experiment, reported herein, tend to reflect that this

circumstance tends to lead to a desire for professional help rather than to an attack on the basic value of publicity itself.

Support for the conclusion that publicity is worth-while comes in some measure from the fact that its use has been a fact of life in the library since before the turn of this century. Activities which are not felt to be productive are the first to suffer when time and money are allocated. Because library time and money continue to be expended in pursuit of the objectives of the publicity program, it surely can be assumed that such expenditures are considered to be justified.

Much of the literature in recent years has centered on two basic aspects of library publicity: how to plan it, and how to do it. By its very existence, this type of library literature clearly implies at least two things: library publicity is considered by those who are writing to be important enough to justify the effort to instruct those who do it in the proper techniques, and some evaluation--formal or informal--of the results must be taking place to stimulate efforts to improve the library publicity techniques. A further indication of recognition of the value of library publicity is to be found in the fact that 73 percent of the busy individuals to whom survey questionnaires were sent took the time and trouble to register their feelings and opinions in the matter.

What is lacking in the library literature is any indication of a concerted effort to crystallize the basics of library publicity in a manner which will permit meaningful evaluation. Are the programs to reach the library's public truly reaching the target? Is the library telling its public? Is anyone listening? How do we know?

From analysis of the results of the 1973 Ohio survey reported here, some tentative conclusions are possible. Their significance is, however, to be taken as indicative only. It must be remembered that these results reflect only the opinions of a small random sample of the public librarians and newsmen in one state of the United States. They may not be representative of other opinions or other attitudes under other conditions in other localities.

The results indicate that the average public library's publicity program tends to be a cooperative effort between librarian and news media, with the initiative somewhat more likely to originate with the library. This might be expected--the library is more intimately concerned with its own message than are the media.

Librarians, on the basis of survey results, can expect that the material they prepare for release will be used by the news media a good portion of the time. However, greater success can be expected with the printed media than with the electronic, calling for greater effort on the library's part to use available broadcasting facilities. Existence of an unused potential in the radio-television area is suggested by the reported belief by librarians that they are making more frequent use of public service time than broadcast newsmen believe to be the case. One surveyed station reported: "A recent open house at the local library was reported to a newspaper for coverage, but not radio. We felt the occasion would have been more successful had we been informed." One big-city television station commented: "Library information service locally is not aggressive or visually oriented. Staff always cordial in responding to requests, but could initiate more coverage."

Survey results in regard to actual and desired content of the average library's publicity program were substantially what an informed observer might have expected. The written news release, although somewhat less popular with broadcast newsmen than with their ink-wielding counterparts in the city room, was reported to be the mainstay of the program. Furthermore, its right to that designation was accepted by most of the responders. Other publicity services usually carried on by public libraries included continuing contact between library staff and news staff, the provision by librarians of background information for reporters, and the giving of tips or leads on news stories. Most of the librarians also reported providing photographs.

The desired publicity program for the broadcast media of radio and television varied somewhat from the librarian's idea of what such a program should be, suggesting that closer coordination between library and broadcasting studio may be in order. Broadcasters seem to want more program ideas and suggestions for interview subjects than are being provided them. In the comparison of the content of the "ideal" library publicity program, the librarians and the newspaper reporters seem to see more nearly eye to eye than is the case with the other groups. In short, the library's publicity program tends to be print oriented.

No strong areas of dissatisfaction with the library's program on the part of any segment of the news media were noted. All of the four subgroups surveyed revealled themselves as substantially in agreement on most matters concerned in the survey.

Despite a pre-survey opinion that librarians would feel that a good job was being done with publicity and that the news media would be of the opinion that a much lower evaluation was in order, there turned

out to be no significant disagreement among the subgroups surveyed. A consensus of the librarians surveyed evaluated the over-all publicity program of the library as Fairly Good, as did a consensus of newspaper reporters surveyed. For television newsmen, the rating was only Fair, while the radio sample felt it was less than Fair. In short, results show that the public librarians are doing less well with publicity than they should, and that they are aware of it. The recipients of their program--the newsmen--are also aware of the lack, an awareness which is somewhat more acute and stringent in the broadcast studios of Ohio than in the newspapers' city rooms. Viewed in its implications, this is a healthy situation which promises well for the future improvement of the public library's publicity program. The attitude of one of the radio newsmen surveyed may well be typical of this thrust for improvement; he comments: "Unfortunately we have no rapport whatsoever with our library. Apparently, they have made no initiative toward us to date. However, I have just taken over Public Service duties . . . and plan to take the initiative myself. I feel that the library has been overlooked by radio stations far too long."

Techniques for valid analysis of attitudes and opinions of the recipients of publicity are in existence; although there is little or no evidence that they are being used by librarians to further the aims and goals of librarianship. One surveyed librarian commented: "Delighted to hear that people are actually interested in library-oriented public relations. Best wishes. . . . we do have to let people know what libraries can do." Another says: "American Library Association and state library associations could work wonders promoting promotion for libraries,

if only they would get in gear and do something." Another comment by a radio newsman is pertinent: "It has been my experience that often there are things of interest happening with libraries that newsmen could make use of and stations could promote. The problem is finding out about them, as most libraries rarely bother with notices or releases."

The limited results of this present restricted survey point up the need for a body of basic data to reflect the effectiveness of the broad spectrum of library publicity. It is strongly recommended that data be secured from a national sample of librarians, newsmen, and, if possible, from library patrons. Furthermore, this data should be collected frequently and analyzed in an attempt to detect trends in the improvement or deterioration of the library publicity program.

Only through the collection and analysis of such data--repeated periodically--will present and future librarians be successful in coming to any genuinely valid conclusions about what should go into an effective library publicity program, and arriving at any determinations about the efficiency of their own programs.

APPENDIX A

Letter and Questionnaire

for Public Libraries

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please pass this to the staff member who handles your Publicity Program . . .

C O F F E E

IS ON ME (if this dime still buys a cup)

. . . in return for about 5 minutes spent in checking off your opinions about public library publicity on the enclosed brief questionnaire. For your convenience, a stamped envelope is enclosed for its return.

I am a fellow Ohioan who urgently needs the requested data -- which only you can provide -- in order to complete requirements for my graduate degree of Master of Library Science. Your invaluable assistance will be most sincerely appreciated.

As my thesis project, I am conducting a random survey of Ohio librarians and news-media people, soliciting and analyzing their opinions on the public library's general publicity program. Ohio has been selected for the study as a representative Midwestern state, in which the public library has had a lengthy and highly regarded history of service to the public.

No attempt is being made to match or compare opinions of news people with those of librarians in the same community. The survey is aimed at uncovering general attitudes of the various groups of individuals who are involved in the continuing process of reporting to the public on its public libraries.

Thank you in advance, fellow librarian, for your essential help in bringing my project to a timely and successful conclusion.

Please enjoy your coffee . . . and let me have your opinions as soon as possible before October 12th.

Sincerely yours,

John D. Rugg
Post Office Box 1387
Provo, Utah 84601

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIB - NEW - RAD - TV
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11 12 13 14 15 16 17
18 19 20 21 22 23 24
25 26 27 28 29 30 31

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY'S PUBLICITY PROGRAM

An Opinion Survey

Since this is an opinion survey, there are, of course, no correct answers. What is solicited are your personal opinions, based on your experience, on the content and effectiveness of the public library's publicity program in general. Please check one or more responses, as appropriate, to each of the questions and return the form in the stamped return envelope as soon as possible before October 12th. Thank you. The numbers in parentheses by answer blanks are computer codes; please ignore them.

1. In your present position, are you at least partially responsible for your library's publicity program, by which is meant here only its continuing efforts to reach the public indirectly through the news-media outlets of newspaper, radio and television?

   (1-1) ___ Yes (1-2) ___ No

2. Have you had such responsibility in one or more libraries other than the one in which you are now working?

   (2-1) ___ Yes (2-2) ___ No

3. About how many years have you worked with a public library's publicity program?

   (3-1) ___ less than one (3-2) ___ 1 to 5 (3-3) ___ more than 5

4. Please check EACH item which is a normal part of your library's continuing publicity program:

   (4-1) ___ written news releases

   (4-2) ___ photographic items

   (4-3) ___ occasional verbal tips or leads on news stories

   (4-4) ___ continuing contact with reporters (newspaper, radio or television)

   (4-5) ___ suggestions for feature stories or radio or television programs

   (4-6) ___ suggestions of people to be interviewed (visiting authors, etc.)

   (4-7) ___ news conferences

   (4-8) ___ provision of background information to reporters

   (4-9) ___ other (please specify) _____

5. In the preceding list, please UNDERLINE ALL ITEMS (whether they are a part of your present program or not) which you believe OUGHT TO BE a basic part of EVERY public library's publicity program.

6. When your library has contact with a news-media outlet (newspaper, radio or television station), is the contact usually initiated by . . .

   (6-1) ___ the library? (6-2) ___ the news-media outlet?

   (6-3) ___ could be either one

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Based on your experience, how would you rate the quality of the written material usually issued by public libraries to news-media outlets?

(7-1) ___ Excellent

(7-2) ___ Good

(7-3) ___ Fair

(7-4) ___ Poor

8. How frequently, in your experience, does such library-released material appear to be used by the news-media outlets concerned?

(8-1) ___ Nearly always

(8-2) ___ Usually

(8-3) ___ Often

(8-4) ___ Occasionally

(8-5) ___ Almost never

9A. Does your library normally make use of the public service time on the air which radio and television stations must make available to public agencies in order to retain their licenses?

(9-1) ___ Yes, frequently

(9-2) ___ Yes, occasionally

(9-3) ___ No

9B. Do you feel that your library receives an equitable amount of coverage in the local newspaper(s)?

(9-7) ___ Yes, largely because of our publicity program

(9-8) ___ Yes, largely due to the interest of the newspaper(s)

(9-9) ___ No

10. In general, based upon your experience, how would you rate the publicity program of the public library or libraries you have known?

(10-1) ___ Excellent

(10-2) ___ Good

(10-3) ___ Fair

(10-4) ___ Poor

(10-5) ___ Virtually nonexistent

11. If you have further specific comments on this subject, I would be interested in having you give them here . . .

12. Since the coding on page one of this form identifies the agency to which this form was sent, it is not necessary for you to provide that information. If, on the other hand, you are interested in receiving an analysis of the results of this random sampling of public libraries, newspapers, and radio and television stations in Ohio, please provide your name and address below:

13. Please check to be sure you have answered all ten questions, especially No. 5, and return this form in the return envelope by October 12, 1973, to:

John D. Pugg
Post Office Box 1387
Provo, Utah 84601

THANK YOU most sincerely for your valued assistance in this project!

APPENDIX B

Letter and Questionnaire

for Newspapers

NOTE: The third page of the questionnaire is not included here, as it was identical in all versions (see appendix A).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please pass this to the reporter who covers Public Library news . . .

C O F F E E

IS ON ME (if this dime still buys a cup)

. . . in return for about 5 minutes spent in checking off your opinions about public library publicity on the enclosed brief questionnaire. For your convenience, a stamped envelope is enclosed for its return.

I am a fellow Ohioan who urgently needs the requested data -- which only you can provide -- in order to complete requirements for my graduate degree of Master of Library Science. Your invaluable assistance will be most sincerely appreciated.

As my thesis project, I am conducting a random survey of Ohio librarians and news people, soliciting and analyzing their opinions on the publicity program of the public library. Ohio has been selected as a representative Midwestern state, in which the public library has a lengthy history.

No attempt is being made to match or compare opinions of librarians and news people in the same community. The survey is aimed at uncovering general attitudes of the various groups of individuals involved in the continuing process of reporting to the public on its public libraries.

Thank you in advance for your essential help in bringing my project to a timely and successful conclusion.

Please enjoy your coffee . . . and let me have your opinions as soon as possible before October 12th.

Sincerely yours,

John D. Rugg
Post Office Box 1387
Provo, Utah 84601

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIB - NEW - RAD - TV
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11 12 13 14 15 16 17
18 19 20 21 22 23 24
25 26 27 28 29 30 31

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY'S PUBLICITY PROGRAM

An Opinion Survey

Since this is an opinion survey, there are, of course, no correct answers. What is solicited are your personal opinions, based on your experience, on the content and effectiveness of the publicity program of public libraries. Please check one or more responses, as appropriate, to each of the questions and return the form in the stamped return envelope as soon as possible before October 12th. Thank you. The numbers in parentheses by answer blanks are computer codes; please ignore them.

1. In your present position, do you handle some or all coverage, if any, of public library news and events?

   (1-1) ___ Yes (1-2) ___ No

2. Have you handled such library coverage for other newspapers?

   (2-1) ___ Yes (2-2) ___ No

3. About how many years have you covered public library news?

   (3-1) ___ less than one (3-2) ___ 1 to 5 (3-3) ___ more than 5

4. Please check EACH item which, in your experience, is normally a part of the service your newspaper receives from the public library:

   (4-1) ___ written news releases

   (4-2) ___ photographs

   (4-3) ___ occasional verbal tips or leads on news stories

   (4-4) ___ continuing contact with a library staff member

   (4-5) ___ suggestions for feature stories

   (4-6) ___ suggestions of possible interviewees (visiting authors, etc.)

   (4-7) ___ invitations to news conferences

   (4-8) ___ provision of current background information

   (4-9) ___ other (please specify) _____

5. In the preceding list, please UNDERLINE ALL ITEMS which, in your opinion, OUGHT TO BE a part of the basic publicity program of EVERY public library.

6. When your newspaper has contact with a public library, is it your experience that the contact is usually initiated by . . .

   (6-1) ___ the library? (6-2) ___ your newspaper?

   (6-3) ___ could be either one

7. Based on your experience, how would you rate the quality of the written material usually issued by public libraries for use by newspapers?

(7-1) ___ Excellent

(7-2) ___ Good

(7-3) ___ Fair

(7-4) ___ Poor

8. How frequently, in your experience, is a newspaper able to use the material provided to it by the public library?

(8-1) ___ Nearly always

(8-2) ___ Usually

(8-3) ___ Often

(8-4) ___ Occasionally

(8-5) ___ Almost never

9. Do you feel that the public library receives an equitable amount of coverage in the newspaper?

(9-7) ___ Yes, largely because of the library's publicity program

(9-8) ___ Yes, largely because of the newspaper's interest

(9-9) ___ No

10. In general, based upon your experience, how would you rate the publicity program of the public library or libraries you have known?

(10-1) ___ Excellent

(10-2) ___ Good

(10-3) ___ Fair

(10-4) ___ Poor

(10-5) ___ Virtually nonexistent

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire for Radio and Television Stations

NOTE: The letter to radio and television stations was identical to that sent to newspapers (see appendix B), and the third page of the questionnaire was identical in all cases.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIB - NEW - RAD - TV
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11 12 13 14 15 16 17
18 19 20 21 22 23 24
25 26 27 28 29 30 31

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY'S PUBLICITY PROGRAM

An Opinion Survey

Since this is an opinion survey, there are, of course, no correct answers. What is solicited are your personal opinions, based on your experience, on the content and effectiveness of the publicity program of public libraries. Please check one or more responses, as appropriate, to each of the questions and return the form in the stamped return envelope as soon as possible before October 12th. Thank you. The numbers in parentheses by answer blanks are computer codes; please ignore them.

1. In your present position, do you handle some or all coverage, if any, of public library news and events for your station?

   (1-1) ___ Yes (1-2) ___ No

2. Have you handled such library coverage for other stations?

   (2-1) ___ Yes (2-2) ___ No

3. About how many years have you covered public library news?

   (3-1) ___ less than one (3-2) ___ 1 to 5 (3-3) ___ more than 5

4. Please check EACH item which, in your experience, is normally a part of the service your station receives from the public library:

   (4-1) ___ written news releases

   (4-2) ___ photographic items (visuals)

   (4-3) ___ occasional verbal tips or leads on news stories

   (4-4) ___ continuing contact with a library staff member

   (4-5) ___ suggestions for possible program features

   (4-6) ___ suggestions of possible interviewees (visiting authors, etc.)

   (4-7) ___ invitations to news conferences

   (4-8) ___ provision of background information

   (4-9) ___ other (please specify) _____

5. In the preceding list, please UNDERLINE ALL ITEMS which, in your opinion, OUGHT TO BE a part of the basic publicity program of EVERY public library, as it relates to the needs of your station.

6. When your station has contact with a public library, is it your experience that the contact is usually initiated by . . .

   (6-1) ___ the library? (6-2) ___ your station?

   (6-3) ___ could be either one

7. Based on your experience, how would you rate the quality of the written material usually issued by public libraries for use by your type of station?

   (7-1) ___ Excellent

   (7-2) ___ Good

   (7-3) ___ Fair

   (7-4) ___ Poor

8. How frequently, in your experience, is your type of station able to use the material provided to it by the public library?

   (8-1) ___ Nearly always

   (8-2) ___ Usually

   (8-3) ___ Often

   (8-4) ___ Occasionally

   (8-5) ___ Almost never

9. Does the public library normally make use of the public service time available on your station?

   (9-1) ___ Yes, frequently

   (9-2) ___ Yes, occasionally

   (9-3) ___ No

10. In general, based upon your experience, how would you rate the publicity program of the public library or libraries you have known?

   (10-1) ___ Excellent

   (10-2) ___ Good

   (10-3) ___ Fair

   (10-4) ___ Poor

   (10-5) ___ Virtually nonexistent

APPENDIX D

Some Selected Comments

by Survey Responders

APPENDIX D

Some Selected Comments by Survey Responders

Since some of the pertinent comments by Ohio newsmen and public librarians have not been used in the text, they are included here for future reference by interested readers:

From Newspapers:

"Our library furnishes only fair and sometimes poor releases, but staffers are most helpful in tipping us off to incidents that make excellent stories and can be used in pictures with cutlines."

"Our circulation area has two libraries, and branches, for two cities. One library has an alert director and a woman in charge of public relations. They have a weekly column and, in addition, furnish us with many releases, together with good pictures, on their programs, which are many. Their copy is typed, complete, and observes deadlines. The other library has a defensive, secretive attitude. We send a reporter to all board meetings, but this one has many special meetings that they try to keep secret. They also have a weekly column. When space is limited, it doesn't get in. The first library understands . . . the other one resents it."

"Area libraries seem to be interested in publicity--for publicity's sake--not so much what the news story's content is, but how many times the name of the library or librarian is used. Programs for the young and elderly citizens would have high reading interest if done as a feature story instead of the straight who-what-where-type release."

"News releases printed for the local library deal with new books and records available. We have found that members of the library staff will go out of their way to obtain answers to questions asked by me and others on the newspaper staff."

"We have a very alive group of librarians here who are changing the staid image of the library with a lot of nontraditional things--and increasing the circulation along with it, when other libraries are losing ground. I think that the only way publicity, as such, can really help a library is when that library has something worth telling."

From Television Stations:

"In a large station in a large market, it is important to see that information goes to all departments concerned. Public Service, Programming, and News could all make use of various forms of publicity releases, but seldom pass them among each other. So, several copies could be sent, but to save money Public Service Announcements should not be sent to News, etc."

"Our library does an adequate job, since in this town the public library is rarely news. The city is too big, and library news gets pushed out by other events."

"News is the reporting of an event of importance to a significant number of our viewers. If the library does something within this definition, we cover it. Just being a library, buying books and lending them, is not news. But a new film program or record collection might be news. TV news is limited; I have about 16 minutes on the air to cover a million people. The library is more likely to get coverage in a weekly newspaper, so would be wise to look more in that direction with 'run of the mill' stories."

From Librarians:

"Libraries need to have people with newspaper techniques working in publicity jobs in order to take advantage of news media. In small towns where the librarian knows the editor personally, such expertise is not necessary. In dealing with metropolitan newspapers and radio and television stations, some experience is invaluable."

"Our weekly newspaper is not consistent in running library news, which we send every week. The nearby daily, which has a column serving our area, is very cooperative. The radio stations always use the copy we send."

"It is my experience, especially in a large city, that the usual or run-of-the-mill library programs or events do not get publicized by the media simply because they are not 'newsworthy.' We should look to revising and revitalizing our programs to appeal to a wider section of the public."

"Radio and TV publicity is more consistent than newspaper. Our library has strong and aggressive internal public relations program, which patrons seem to accept. Still, the most effective medium is radio."

"The publicity program in most small and medium-sized public libraries is hampered by the fact that it has to be done on a part-time basis by someone who has more urgent responsibilities (often the head librarian). Consequently, it is sporadic and often amateurish (and I include our own publicity program, which I handle). Perhaps development of a cooperative enterprise by a group of libraries might provide a partial solution. We are trying that in our area."

"Ohio has tried a handbook this year, which was helpful, and Wisconsin has a coop going that is good, but that's all I've heard of."

"We make a special effort to abide by the rule that the newsman and his editors are the authorities on what is news."

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Library Association. Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966. Chicago: American Library Association, 1967.

American Library Directory, 1972-73. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1972.

Ayer Directory of Publications, 1973. Philadelphia: Ayer Press, 1973.

Broadcasting Yearbook, 1973. Washington, D.C.: Broadcasting Publications, Inc., 1973.

Budd, John F., Jr., and Strayton, Robert G. "Can Public Relations Be Measured?" Public Relations Quarterly 13 (Winter 1969): 19-24.

Canfield, Bertrand R. Public Relations: Principles, Cases, and Problems. 5th ed. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.

Crowe, Mildred R. "Public Relations," In Handbook of Medical Library Practice. 2d ed. Edited by Janet Doe and Mary Louise Marshall. Chicago: American Library Association, 1956.

De Vos, Larry. "PR Politics." Focus 24 (September 1970): 144-46.

Edgerton, Betty. "Public Information Regional Projects: An Assessment." Louisiana Library Association Bulletin 32 (Fall 1969): 98-103.

Edsall, Marian. "CLIP--The First Nine Months." Wisconsin Library Bulletin 67 (March-April 1971): 91-94.

Evans, Elizabeth Wright. "How to Get Publicity for YOUR Library." Library News Bulletin 36 (October 1969): 258-64.

Fink, Ronn. "Who's Circulating 'Round the Reference Desk's Vertical File?" Wilson Library Bulletin 45 (November 1970): 308-9.

Golden, Hal, and Hanson, Kitty. How to Plan, Produce, and Publicize Special Events. New York: Oceana Publications, 1960.

Hall, Babette. The Right Angles: How to Do Successful Publicity. New York: Ives Washburn, Inc., 1965.

Loizeaux, Marie D. Publicity Primer. 3d rev. ed. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1945.

Marston, John E. The Nature of Public Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

Norton, Alice. "Professional Publicity Services: A 1965 Checklist." Library Journal 90 (September 1, 1965): 3392-96.

Nunmaker, Frances C. The Library Broadcasts. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1948.

Owsley, Clifford. "Making the Mountain Taller." Public Relations Journal 17 (November 1961): 18-22.

Raburn, Josephine. "Public Relations for a 'Special' Public." Special Libraries 60 (December 1969): 647-50.

Rice, Betty. Public Relations for Public Libraries. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1972.

St. Thomas, Charles E. How to Get Industrial and Business Publicity. Philadelphia: Chilton Co., 1956.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A. Publicity Media and Methods: Their Role in Modern Public Relations. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Sherman, Steve. ABC's of Library Promotion. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971.

Titley, Joan. "The Library and Its Publics: Identification and Communications." In Handbook of Medical Library Practice. 3d ed. Edited by Gertrude L. Annan and Jacqueline W. Felter. Chicago: Medical Library Association, 1970.

Wallace, Sarah Leslie. Promotion Ideas for Public Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1953.